arXiv:1405.0748v2 [math-ph] 27 May 2014

TULCZYJEW'S APPROACH FOR PARTICLES IN GAUGE FIELDS

GUOWU MENG

ABSTRACT. In mid-1970s W. M. Tulczyjew discovered an approach to classical mechanics which brings the Hamiltonian formalism and the Lagrangian formalism under a common geometric roof: the dynamics of a particle with configuration space X is determined by a Lagrangian submanifold D of TT^*X (the total tangent space of T^*X), and the description of D by its Hamiltonian $H\colon T^*X \to \mathbb{R}$ (resp. its Lagrangian $L\colon TX \to \mathbb{R}$) yields the Hamilton (resp. Euler-Lagrange) equation.

It is reported here that Tulczyjew's approach also works for the dynamics of (charged) particles in gauge fields, in which the role of the total cotangent space T^*X is played by Sternberg phase spaces. In particular, it is shown that, for a particle in a gauge field, the equation of motion can be locally presented as the Euler-Lagrange equation for a Lagrangian which is the sum of the ordinary Lagrangian $L(q,\dot{q})$, the Lorentz term, and an *extra new term* which vanishes whenever the gauge group is abelian. A charge quantization condition is also derived, generalizing Dirac's charge quantization condition from $\mathrm{U}(1)$ gauge group to any compact connected gauge group.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 2
2. Sternberg phase space 3
2.1. Principal connection 4
2.2. Sternberg form Ω_Θ on $\mathcal{F}$ 4
2.3. Sternberg phase space 6
3. A canonical isomorphism of double vector bundles 6
3.1. Local formulae 9
4. Special symplectic manifold 10
5. Tulczyjew triple and its magnetized version 11
5.1. Classical Tulczyjew triple 11
5.2. Magnetized Tulczyjew triple 12
6. Tulczyjew's approach for particles in gauge fields 15
6.1. The Hamiltonian formulation 15
6.2. The Lagrangian formulation 16
6.3. The Legendre transformation 19
Appendix A. Useful facts 20
A.1. Tangent lift [18] 20
A.2. "Cotangent map" T^*_f 20
Appendix B. A list of symbols 22
References 23

Date: May 1, 2014.
The author is supported by Hong Kong University of Science and Technology under DAG S09/10.SC02.

1. INTRODUCTION

Tulczyjew's unified approach [1] to Lagrangian and Hamiltonian descriptions of particle dynamics, though not well-known outside a small circle of mathematicians and physicists, is quite appealing to geometry-oriented minds. In this approach, the Legendre transformation takes a specially simple interpretation, and systems with singular Lagrangians or subject to constraints appear naturally. An advantage of this geometric approach is its flexibility in the sense that it can be easily adapted to different settings. As one more demonstration of its flexibility, in this article it is shown that Tulczyjew's approach also works for particle dynamics in which a charged particle moves in the presence of an external gauge field, either abelian or non-abelian.

The incorporation of a gauge field into the classical particle dynamics is a nontrivial business when the gauge group is non-abelian. It seems that, in the setting of symplectic geometry, this was initially done by S. Sternberg [2]. Some further elaborations, especially the one on the relationship of Sternberg's symplectic approach with the earlier Poisson approach of S. K. Wong [3], came from A. Weinstein [4] and R. Montgomery [5].

For readers who are familiar with the notion of double vector bundle in the sense of Pradines [6] (or equivalently in the sense of Grabowski and Rotkiewicz [7]) and closely-related notion of double Lie algebroid in the sense of K. Mackenzie [8] (or equivalently in the sense of T. Voronov [9]), it is worth to remark that, just as Tulczyjew's original approach to particle dynamics, our extension to dynamics of charged particle rests on the following mathematical fact [10]: *a real vector bundle $E \to X$ and its dual vector bundle $E^* \to X$ are not canonically isomorphic, but their associated double vector bundles $(T^*E^*; E^*, E^{**}; X)$ and $(T^*E; E^*, E; X)$ are.*

All ingredients involved in the present work have already appeared in the literature, but they will be reviewed here for completeness. It should be pointed out that, the main result obtained here would appear earlier (especially in Ref. [11]) if enough attention was paid to Sternberg phase spaces. After communicating with J. Grabowski and P. Urbański, the author learned that there had been an approach to electrically charged particles based on affine geometries [12, 13, 14]; this is associated with $\mathbb{R}$-principal bundles, but a reasonable extension to non-abelian gauge fields may also be possible.

In Section 2 a detailed review of Sternberg phase space [2] is presented. For our purpose, the presentation given here focuses more on the explicit local computations. In Section 3 a detailed review of the canonical isomorphism $T^*E^* \cong T^*E$ for any real vector bundle $E \to X$ is presented. This isomorphism is more natural when it is viewed as the canonical double vector bundle isomorphism from $(T^*E^*; E^*, E^{**}; X)$ onto $(T^*E; E^*, E; X)$; moreover, it enables Tulczyjew to bring the Lagrangian description of classical mechanics to the domain of symplectic geometry and unify Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms of classical mechanics under a single geometric roof. In Section 4 we review Tulczyjew's notion of *special symplectic manifold*, a concept more refined than that of symplectic manifold. In Section 5 we first review the classical Tulczyjew triple used in the Tulczyjew's approach to particle dynamics and then introduce its magnetized version where Sternberg phase spaces play the role of T^*X. Section 6 contains new results. Here, the Hamiltonian side of Tulczyjew's approach, taken from Ref. [1], works for arbitrary symplectic manifold M, not just for the Sternberg phase space. The magnetized version of Tulczyjew triple introduced in Section 5 enables us to work out the Lagrangian side of Tulczyjew's approach to particles in gauge fields. In particular, for particles in Yang-Mills fields, a Lagrangian approach in the usual textbook way is derived, for which

the Lagrangian is the sum of the ordinary Lagrangian $L(q, \dot{q})$, the Lorentz term, and an *extra new term*. A generalized version of Dirac's *charge quantization condition* [15] is also derived from this Lagrangian approach. (Please consult the Main Theorem on page 17 for precise statement.) As far as this author knows, the aforementioned Lagrangian and charge quantization condition are new; cf. Ref. [19] and example 2 on page 18.

For the convenience of readers, in the appendix we list some symbols used in this article, along with technically useful facts on tangent lift operator and on fiber bundle equipped with a connection. Most of symbols used in this article are quite standard in the mathematical literature, for example, $\tau_X\colon TX \to X$ denotes the tangent bundle of X, $\pi_X\colon T^*X \to X$ denotes the cotangent bundle of X, ϑ_X denotes the Liouville form on T^*X and $\omega_X := \mathrm{d}\vartheta_X$ denotes the tautological symplectic form on T^*X. Also, *for notational sanity in this article, we shall use the same notation for both a differential form (or a map) and its pullback under a fiber bundle projection map*. For example, for a differential form Ω on manifold F, its pullback under projection $X \times F \to F$ is also denoted by Ω.

Acknowledgements. The author learned Tulczyjew's elegant approach from Janusz Grabowski at the recent workshop on Geometry of Mechanics and Control Theory (India Institute of Sciences, Bangalore, India, January 2 - 10, 2014). Besides thanking Janusz Grabowski for his beautiful talk, he would also like to thank Partha Guha for organizing the wonderful workshop. Finally, he would like to thank John Baez, Janusz Grabowski, Jim Stasheff and Pawel Urbański for providing either valuable comments or additional references.

2. Sternberg phase space

Throughout this section we assume that X is a manifold, G is a compact connected Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, $P \to X$ is a principal G-bundle with a fixed principal connection form Θ, and F is a hamiltonian G-space with symplectic form Ω and (equivariant) moment map Φ. Recall that we shall use the same notation for both a differential form (or a map) and its pullback under a fiber bundle projection map. For example, the pullback of the moment map Φ under projection $X \times F \to F$ is also denoted by Φ.

Let $\mathcal{F} := P \times_G F$ and $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ be the pullback of diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{F} \\ & & \downarrow \\ T^*X & \xrightarrow{\pi_X} & X \end{array}$$

Sternberg observed that [2], with the above data, there is a correct substitute Ω_Θ on $\mathcal{F}$ for Ω on $X \times F$, in the sense that Ω_Θ is a closed real differential two-form on $\mathcal{F}$ and it is equal to Ω when $P \to X$ is a trivial bundle with the product connection. He further observed that, if ω_X denote the canonical symplectic form on T^*X, then

$$\omega_X + \Omega_\Theta$$

is a symplectic form on $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ — the **Sternberg symplectic form**.

To describe the Sternberg symplectic form, we need to do some preparations. For $a \in G$, the right action of a on P is denoted by R_a and the adjoint action of a on $\mathfrak{g}$ is denoted by Ad_a. For $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$, the infinitesimal right action of ξ on P is a vector field on P and shall be denoted by X_ξ. Since G is a compact connected Lie group, we can assume that it is a

Lie subgroup of $\mathrm{SO}(N)$ for some positive integer N. Let us denote by g the inclusion map of G into the vector space of all real square matrices of order N. Note that, in terms of g, the Maurer-Cartan form on G can be written as $g^{-1}\,\mathrm{d}g$, here, the product between g^{-1} and $\mathrm{d}g$ is the matrix multiplication.

2.1. **Principal connection.** Let Θ be a $\mathfrak{g}$-valued differential one-form on P. Then Θ is/defines a principal connection on the principal G-bundle $P \to X$ if it satisfies the following two conditions[1]:

$$1)\ {R_{a^{-1}}}^*\,\Theta = \mathrm{Ad}_a\Theta \text{ for any } a \in G, \qquad 2)\ \Theta(X_\xi) = \xi \text{ for any } \xi \in \mathfrak{g}.$$

Working locally, we may assume that $P \to X$ is trivial. Suppose that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times G & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\phi} & P \\ & \searrow \quad \swarrow & \\ & M & \end{array}$$

is a trivialization, then, as a $\mathfrak{g}$-valued differential one-form on $X \times G$,

$$\boxed{\phi^*\Theta = g^{-1}A_\phi g + g^{-1}\,\mathrm{d}g} \tag{2.1}$$

for a unique $\mathfrak{g}$-valued differential one-form A_ϕ on X. Similarly, if ϕ' is another trivialization, we have

$$\phi'^*\Theta = g^{-1}A_{\phi'}g + g^{-1}\,\mathrm{d}g$$

for a unique $\mathfrak{g}$-valued differential one-form $A_{\phi'}$ on X. To see how A_ϕ and $A_{\phi'}$ are related, we note that the bundle isomorphism λ defined by the commutative triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & P & \\ {\scriptstyle\phi}\nearrow & & \nwarrow{\scriptstyle\phi'} \\ X \times G & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & X \times G \end{array}$$

can be written as $\lambda(x,b) = (x, a(x)b)$ for a unique smooth map $a\colon X \to G$. Since $\phi^*\Theta = \lambda^*\phi'^*\Theta$, we have

$$A_\phi = a^{-1}A_{\phi'}a + a^{-1}\,\mathrm{d}a \quad \text{or} \quad \boxed{A_{\phi'} = aA_\phi a^{-1} + a\,\mathrm{d}a^{-1}}. \tag{2.2}$$

2.2. **Sternberg form Ω_Θ on $\mathcal{F}$.** For the hamiltonian G-space F, recall that Ω is its symplectic form and $\Phi\colon F \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ is its moment map. We let Y_ξ be the vector field on F which represents the infinitesimal left action of $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ on F. Then Ω is invariant under the G-action on F, Φ is G-equivariant, and

$$Y_\xi \lrcorner\, \Omega = \langle \xi, \mathrm{d}\Phi \rangle \quad \text{for any } \xi \in \mathfrak{g}. \tag{2.3}$$

Here $\lrcorner$ denotes the interior product and $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$ denotes the paring of elements in $\mathfrak{g}$ with elements in $\mathfrak{g}^*$. In view of the fact that Φ is G-equivariant, Eq. (2.3) implies that

$$\Omega(Y_{\xi_1}, Y_{\xi_2}) = \langle [\xi_1, \xi_2], \Phi \rangle \quad \text{for any } \xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathfrak{g}. \tag{2.4}$$

[1]Our Θ here is the negative of the Θ in Ref. [2] because R_a is right multiplication by a here and by a^{-1} in Ref. [2].

Denote by ϕ_F the composition map $X \times F \cong (X \times G) \times_G F \overset{\phi \times_G F}{\longrightarrow} P \times_G F =: \mathcal{F}$. If we let λ_F be the fiber bundle isomorphism in the commutative triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{F} & \\ {\scriptstyle \phi_F}\nearrow & & \nwarrow{\scriptstyle \phi'_F} \\ X \times F & \xrightarrow{\lambda_F} & X \times F, \end{array}$$

then $\lambda_F(x, f) = (x, a(x) \cdot f)$. Let

$$\boxed{\Omega_\phi := \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle A_\phi, \Phi\rangle}.$$

The following lemma implies that there is a well-defined closed real differential two-form Ω_Θ on $\mathcal{F}$, referred to as the **Sternberg form** on $\mathcal{F}$, such that $\Omega_\phi = \phi_F^* \Omega_\Theta$.

Lemma 2.1. *With the notations as above, we have $\lambda_F^* \, \Omega_{\phi'} = \Omega_\phi$. Consequently, as closed real differential two-forms on $\mathcal{F}$, $({\phi_F}^{-1})^* \Omega_\phi = ({\phi'_F}^{-1})^* \Omega_{\phi'}$.*

Since $\Omega_{\phi'} = \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle A_{\phi'}, \Phi\rangle$ and $\Omega_\phi = \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle A_\phi, \Phi\rangle$, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \lambda_F^* \Omega_{\phi'} & = & \lambda_F^* \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle A_{\phi'}, L_a^* \Phi\rangle \quad \text{here } L_a \text{ is the left action of } a \text{ on } F \\ & = & \lambda_F^* \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle A_{\phi'}, {\mathrm{Ad}_{a^{-1}}}^* \Phi\rangle \quad \text{because } \Phi \text{ is } G\text{-equivariant} \\ & = & \lambda_F^* \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle \mathrm{Ad}_{a^{-1}} A_{\phi'}, \Phi\rangle \\ & = & \lambda_F^* \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle A_\phi, \Phi\rangle + \mathrm{d}\langle a^{-1}\mathrm{d}a, \Phi\rangle \quad \text{using Eq. (2.2)} \\ & = & \Omega_\phi + \lambda_F^* \Omega - \Omega + \mathrm{d}\langle a^{-1}\mathrm{d}a, \Phi\rangle, \end{array}$$

so the above lemma is equivalent to

Claim. *Let λ_F: $X \times F \to X \times F$, Φ: $F \to \mathfrak{g}^*$, a: $X \to G$, and Ω be as before. Then $\lambda_F^* \Omega = \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle a^{-1}\mathrm{d}a, \Phi\rangle$.*

Proof. Let $\xi = \mathrm{d}a \, a^{-1}$. Since $\lambda_F(x, f) = (x, a(x) \cdot f)$, we have

$$\begin{array}{rccl} T_{(x,f)}\lambda_F : & T_x X \times T_f F & \to & T_x X \times T_{a(x)\cdot f} F \\ & (u, v) & \mapsto & (u, T_f L_{a(x)}(v) + (Y_{u \lrcorner \xi|_x})|_{a(x)\cdot f}). \end{array}$$

With the understanding that Ω represents both the symplectic form on F and its pullback under projection $X \times F \to F$, for (u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) in $T_{(x,f)}(X \times F)$,

$$(\lambda_F^* \Omega)|_{(x,f)}((u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2))$$

is equal to

$$\begin{array}{l} (L_{a(x)}^* \Omega)|_f(v_1, v_2) \\ + \Omega(Y_{u_1 \lrcorner \xi|_x}, Y_{u_2 \lrcorner \xi|_x})|_{a(x)\cdot f} \\ + \Omega|_{a(x)\cdot f}(Y_{u_1 \lrcorner \xi|_x}|_{a(x)\cdot f}, T_f L_{a(x)}(v_2)) - \Omega|_{a(x)\cdot f}(Y_{u_2 \lrcorner \xi|_x}|_{a(x)\cdot f}, T_f L_{a(x)}(v_1)). \end{array}$$

Let $\eta = a^{-1} \, \mathrm{d}a$. Then, in view of the fact that Φ is G-equivariant and $\eta = \mathrm{ad}_{a^{-1}}\xi$, the above expression becomes

$$\begin{array}{rl} & \Omega|_f(v_1, v_2) \quad \text{because } \Omega \text{ is } G\text{-invariant} \\ & + \langle [u_1 \lrcorner \eta|_x, u_2 \lrcorner \eta|_x], \Phi|_f\rangle \quad \text{using Eq. (2.4)} \\ & + \langle u_1 \lrcorner \eta|_x, v_2 \lrcorner \mathrm{d}\Phi|_f\rangle - \langle u_2 \lrcorner \eta|_x, v_1 \lrcorner \mathrm{d}\Phi|_f\rangle \quad \text{using Eq. (2.3)} \\ = & \Omega|_f(v_1, v_2) + \langle \eta^2|_x, \Phi|_f\rangle(u_1, u_2) + \langle \eta|_x, \mathrm{d}\Phi|_f\rangle((u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2)) \\ = & (\Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle \eta, \Phi\rangle)|_{(x,f)}((u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2)) \quad \text{because } d\eta = -\eta^2. \end{array}$$

Therefore $\lambda_F^* \Omega = \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle \eta, \Phi\rangle = \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle a^{-1}\mathrm{d}a, \Phi\rangle$. □

2.3. **Sternberg phase space.** With the Sternberg form Ω_Θ on $\mathcal{F}$ and the canonical symplectic form ω_X on T^*X being both closed, and the fact from the definition of $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ that there are fiber bundle projections from $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ to $\mathcal{F}$ and also to T^*X, we know that

$$\boxed{\omega_\Theta := \omega_X + \Omega_\Theta} \tag{2.5}$$

is a closed real differential two-form on $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$.

Claim. *With the notations as above, ω_Θ is non-degenerate everywhere on $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$, so it is a symplectic form on $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$.*

Proof. Introducing local coordinate functions (q^i, p_j) on T^*X and z^α on F, and denoting $\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}$ by ∂_i, $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\alpha}$ by ∂_α, then ω_Θ can be locally represented by

$$\mathrm{d}p_i \wedge \mathrm{d}q^i + \frac{1}{2}\Omega_{\alpha\beta}\,\mathrm{d}z^\alpha \wedge \mathrm{d}z^\beta - \frac{1}{2}\langle \partial_i A_j - \partial_j A_i, \Phi\rangle\, \mathrm{d}q^i \wedge \mathrm{d}q^j + \langle A_i, \partial_\alpha \Phi\rangle\, \mathrm{d}q^i \wedge \mathrm{d}z^\alpha$$

which is then easy to see to be non-degenerate everywhere. Therefore, ω_Θ is a symplectic form on $P^\sharp$. □

In summary, we have

Theorem 2.2 (Sternberg, 1977)**.** *With the data and notations given in the beginning of this section, we have the following statements.*

1) There is a closed real differential two-form Ω_Θ on $\mathcal{F}$ which is of the form $\Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle A, \Phi\rangle$ under a local trivialization of $P \to X$ in which the connection form Θ is represented by the $\mathfrak{g}$-valued differential one-form A on X.

2) The differential two-form $\omega_\Theta := \omega_X + \Omega_\Theta$ is a symplectic form on $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$.

The symplectic manifold $(\mathcal{F}^\sharp, \omega_\Theta)$ is referred to as a **Sternberg phase space**. In particular (T^*X, ω_X) is a Sternberg phase space. In Ref. [4] A. Weinstein introduced a symplectic space out of the principal G-bundle $P \to X$ and the hamiltonian G-space F, and showed that a connection Θ on $P \to X$ yields a symplectomorphism from his symplectic space to the Sternberg phase space $(\mathcal{F}^\sharp, \omega_\Theta)$, a reason for A. Weinstein to call his symplectic space the *universal phase space*.

3. A CANONICAL ISOMORPHISM OF DOUBLE VECTOR BUNDLES

The purpose of this section is to give a detailed review of the following simple and elegant mathematical fact [10]: *a real vector bundle $E \to X$ and its dual vector bundle $E^* \to X$ are not canonically isomorphic, but T^*E^* and T^*E are canonically isomorphic as symplectic manifolds.*

Let $\pi\colon\ E \to X$ be a real vector bundle and $\pi^*\colon\ E^* \to X$ be its dual vector bundle. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^*X & & E^* \\ & \searrow^{\pi_X} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi^*} \\ E & \xrightarrow{\ \pi\ } & X \end{array} \tag{3.1}$$

The limit of diagram (3.1) exists and is unique up to diffeomorphisms, in fact, it is the total space of the Whitney sum of the three vector bundles over X. We shall show that both T^*E^* and T^*E can be this limit, so they must be diffeomorphic to each other. The detailed arguments are given below.

Step one. For any $e \in E$, we have injective linear map $E_{\pi(e)} \cong T_e E_{\pi(e)} \subset T_e E$ whose dual is a surjective linear map $T_e^* E \to E_{\pi(e)}^*$ which, upon being globalized, becomes the top arrow p_E in the commutative square

(3.2)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^*E & \xrightarrow{p_E} & E^* \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_E}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi^*} \\ E & \xrightarrow{\pi} & X. \end{array}$$

Step two. Choosing a connection on $E \to X$, then we have the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^*E & \xrightarrow{T_\pi^*} & T^*X \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_E}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_X} \\ E & \xrightarrow{\pi} & X \end{array}$$

by appendix A.

Step three. Combining steps one and two, we have commutative diagram

(3.3)


which in turn yields a smooth map $T^*E \to T^*X \oplus E \oplus E^*$, fibering over X. This smooth map is a bijection because $T_e^* E \to T_{\pi(e)}^* X \times \{e\} \times E_{\pi(e)}^*$ is a bijection for each $e \in E$. Moreover, by using the local triviality of $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$, one can check that this map is a diffeomorphism, so it turns $T^*E \to X$ into a vector bundle over X. This vector bundle is isomorphic to $T^*X \oplus E \oplus E^*$, but it is not canonical because of its dependence on the choice of a connection on $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$.

Step four. Since $E^{**} \cong E$ naturally and a connection on $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$ is turned into a connection on $E^* \xrightarrow{\pi^*} X$ upon taking dual, replacing E by E^* in the above analysis, commutative diagram (3.3) becomes commutative diagram



So we have vector bundle isomorphism $T^*E^* \cong T^*X \oplus E^* \oplus E^{**}$ by the same argument as above.

Step five. Define κ via commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^*E^* & \xrightarrow[\cong]{T^*_{\pi^*} \oplus \pi_{E^*} \oplus p_{E^*}} & T^*X \oplus E^* \oplus E^{**} \\ {\scriptstyle\kappa}\downarrow{\scriptstyle\cong} & & {\scriptstyle\cong}\downarrow{\scriptstyle 1 \oplus 1 \oplus -\iota^{-1}} \\ T^*E & \xrightarrow[\cong]{T^*_{\pi} \oplus p_E \oplus \pi_E} & T^*X \oplus E^* \oplus E \end{array} \tag{3.4}$$

where $-\iota^{-1}$ is the negative of the inverse of the natural vector bundle identification

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \iota : E & \longrightarrow & E^{**} \\ u & \mapsto & \alpha \mapsto \langle u, \alpha \rangle. \end{array} \tag{3.5}$$

We shall see later that, κ is a symplectomorphism and is independent of the choice of a connection on $E \to X$.

In summary, once a connection on $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$ is chosen, T^*E and T^*E^* become vector bundles over X; moreover, we have vector bundle isomorphisms $T^*E \cong T^*X \oplus E \oplus E^*$ and $T^*E^* \cong T^*X \oplus E^* \oplus E^{**}$. Since $E \oplus E^* \cong E^* \oplus E^{**}$, we have vector bundle isomorphism κ: $T^*E^* \to T^*E$ over X. While the vector bundle structures on $T^*E \to X$ and $T^*E^* \to X$ depend on the choice of a connection on $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$, the diffeomorphism κ does not if we identify $E \oplus E^*$ with $E^* \oplus E^{**}$ via

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\iota & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where ι is the map defined in Eq. (3.5). Since π_{E^*}: $T^*E^* \to E^*$ is a vector bundle and the definition of κ in diagram (3.4) makes triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^*E^* & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\kappa} & T^*E \\ & {\scriptstyle\pi_{E^*}}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle p_E} & \\ & E^* & \end{array}$$

commutative, the canonical diffeomorphism κ turns p_E: $T^*E \to E^*$ into a canonical vector bundle so that κ becomes a canonical vector bundle isomorphism over E^* and $(T^*E; E, E^*; X)$ as in diagram (3.2) becomes a (canonical) *double vector bundle* (with $T^*X \xrightarrow{\pi_X} X$ as its core) in the sense of J. Pradines [6].

In short, *to any real vector bundle $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$, there associate two canonically isomorphic double vector bundles $(T^*E; E, E^*; X)$ and $(T^*E^*; E^*, E^{**}; X)$:*



where the dashed arrow is κ. Moreover κ is a symplectomorphism. This isomorphism of double vector bundles shall be referred to as **the canonical isomorphism**.

It remains to show that κ is a canonical symlectomorphism, i.e., it is a symlectomorphism and is independent of the choice of a connection on $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$. That will be clear after we work out a local representation for κ.

3.1. **Local formulae.** Let $n = \dim X$ and k be the rank of $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$. Since we work locally, we may assume that X is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$ is trivial. Let us fix a diffeomorphism $Q\colon X \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and a trivialization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\phi} & X \times \mathbb{R}^k \\ & {\scriptstyle\pi}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle p_1} & \\ & X & \end{array}$$

where p_1 is the projection onto the first factor. Then we have diffeomorphisms

$$E \cong X \times \mathbb{R}^k \cong \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k, \quad E^* \cong X \times (\mathbb{R}^k)^* \cong \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k$$

which shall be denoted by (q, u) and (q, α) respectively, and diffeomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} T^*E &\cong \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k \times (\mathbb{R}^n)^* \times (\mathbb{R}^k)^* \cong (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k)^2, \\ T^*E^* &\cong \mathbb{R}^n \times (\mathbb{R}^k)^* \times (\mathbb{R}^n)^* \times (\mathbb{R}^k)^{**} \cong (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k)^2 \end{aligned}$$

which shall be denoted by (q, u, p, α) and $(q, \alpha, p, \hat{u})$ respectively.

Under the trivialization ϕ, the connection on $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$ is represented by a real $k \times k$-matrix valued differential one-form $A \cdot \mathrm{d}q := A_i \,\mathrm{d}q^i$ on X, according to formula (A.3), the map $T^*E \xrightarrow{T^*_\pi} T^*X$ can be represented by

$$(q, u, p, \alpha) \mapsto (q, p - \alpha \cdot Au) \tag{3.6}$$

where $\cdot$ means the dot product of $\mathbb{R}^k$, and A is viewed as a local function on T^*Y. On the other hand, the connection on $E^* \xrightarrow{\pi^*} X$ is represented by $-A^T$ on X, so, according to formula (A.3), the map $T^*E^* \xrightarrow{T^*_{\pi^*}} T^*X$ can be represented by

$$(q, \alpha, p, \hat{u}) \mapsto (q, p + \hat{u} \cdot A^T\alpha) = (q, p + \alpha \cdot A\hat{u})). \tag{3.7}$$

Note also that, the map $T^*E \xrightarrow{\pi_E} E$ and $T^*E \xrightarrow{p_E} E^*$ are represented by

$$(q, u, p, \alpha) \mapsto (q, u), \quad (q, u, p, \alpha) \mapsto (q, \alpha)$$

respectively, the map $T^*E^* \xrightarrow{\pi_{E^*}} E^*$ and $T^*E^* \xrightarrow{p_{E^*}} E^{**}$ are represented by

$$(q, \alpha, p, \hat{u}) \mapsto (q, \alpha), \quad (q, \alpha, p, \hat{u}) \mapsto (q, \hat{u})$$

respectively, and $\iota\colon E \to E^{**}$ is represented by $(q, u) \mapsto (q, u)$. Therefore, from the definition of κ in diagram (3.4), we conclude that Tulczyjew isomorphism $\kappa\colon T^*E^* \to T^*E$ is represented by

$$(q, \alpha, p, \hat{u}) \mapsto (q, -\hat{u}, p, \alpha). \tag{3.8}$$

This local representation of κ immediately implies that κ preserves the natural symplectic structures, is independent of the choice of connection on $E \xrightarrow{\pi} X$, and fibers over both E^* and E, i.e., both triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^*E^* & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\kappa} & T^*E \\ & {\scriptstyle\pi_{E^*}}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle p_E} & \\ & E^* & \end{array}$$

and square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^*E^* & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\kappa} & T^*E \\ {\scriptstyle p_{E^*}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_E} \\ E^{**} & \xrightarrow[\cong]{-\iota^{-1}} & E \end{array}$$

are commutative, also an easy fact from commutative diagram (3.4).

4. Special symplectic manifold

In mid-1970s W. M. Tulczyjew discovered an approach to classical mechanics which brings the Hamiltonian formalism and the Lagrangian formalism under a common geometric roof: the dynamics of a particle with configuration space X is determined by a Lagrangian submanifold D of TT^*X (the total tangent space of T^*X), and the description of D by its Hamiltonian H: $T^*X \to \mathbb{R}$ (resp. its Lagrangian L: $TX \to \mathbb{R}$) yields the Hamilton (resp. Euler-Lagrange) equation.

To formulate this approach to mechanics, Tulczyjew introduced the notion of *special symplectic manifold*. He observed that, on TT^*X, there is one symplectic manifold structure and two special symplectic manifold structures (refereed to as *Liouville structures* in Ref. [16, 17]); therefore, for a classical particle with configuration space X under a given conservative force, there is one dynamics (i.e., the submanifold D which is Lagrangian with respect to the symplecic structure on TT^*X) and two descriptions of this dynamics (i.e., the description of D via the two Liouville structures on TT^*X).

Let (P, ω) be a symplectic manifold with symplectic form ω, N be a submanifold of P. We say that N is an *isotropic submanifold* of (P, ω) if the pullback of ω under the inclusion $N \hookrightarrow P$ is identically zero, and is an *Lagrangian submanifold* of (P, ω) if it is isotropic and $\dim P = 2 \dim N$.

Definition 4.1. A *special symplectic manifold* is a quadruple (P, M, π, ϑ), where (P, M, π) is a smooth fiber bundle, ϑ is a differential one-form on P, and there is a diffeomorphism α: $P \to T^*M$ such that $\pi = \pi_M \circ \alpha$ and $\vartheta = \alpha^* \vartheta_M$.

The diffeomorphism α is unique, assuming it exists. If (P, M, π, ϑ) is a special symplectic manifold, then $(P, \mathrm{d}\vartheta)$ is a symplectic manifold isomorphic to (T^*M, ω_M), and is called the **underlying symplectic manifold** of (P, M, π, ϑ).

The following proposition is obvious.

Proposition 4.1. *1) Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold. Then $(TM, M, \tau_M, \mathrm{i}_T\omega)$ is a special symplectic manifold.*

2) Let $(P_1, M_1, \pi_1, \vartheta_1)$ and $(P_2, M_2, \pi_2, \vartheta_2)$ be special symplectic manifolds. Then the quadruple $(P_2 \times P_1, M_2 \times M_1, \pi_2 \times \pi_1, \vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1)$ is a special symplectic manifold.

The special symplectic manifold in part 1) is referred to as a **Hamiltonian special symplectic manifold**. For us, the interesting M is T^*X or more generally a Sternberg phase space.

The following two propositions are taken from Ref. [20, Section 3].

Proposition 4.2. *Let (P, M, π, ϑ) be a special symplectic manifold, K a submanifold of M and F a smooth real function on K. Then the set*

$$N := \{p \in \pi^{-1}(K) \mid \iota^*_{\pi^{-1}(K)} \vartheta = (\pi|_{\pi^{-1}(K)})^* \mathrm{d}F \text{ at } p\}$$

is a Lagrangian submanifold of $(P, \mathrm{d}\vartheta)$, $K = \pi(N)$, the mapping ϱ defined by the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N & \xhookrightarrow{\iota_N} & P \\ {\scriptstyle\varrho}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\pi} \\ K & \xhookrightarrow{\iota_K} & M \end{array}$$

is a submersion, the fibers of ϱ are connected and $\iota_N^*\vartheta = \varrho^*\mathrm{d}F$.

The Lagrangian submanifold N in this proposition is called the Lagrangian submanifold *generated* by F, and F is called a *generating function* of N.

Proposition 4.3. *Let (P, M, π, ϑ) be a special symplectic manifold, K a submanifold of M and N an isotropic submanifold of $(P, \mathrm{d}\vartheta)$ such that $K := \pi(N)$ is a submanifold of M, the mapping ϱ defined by the commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N & \xhookrightarrow{\iota_N} & P \\ {\scriptstyle\varrho}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\pi} \\ K & \xhookrightarrow{\iota_K} & M \end{array}$$

is a submersion and the fibers of ϱ are connected. Then there is a unique closed differential form γ on K such that $\iota_N^*\vartheta = \varrho^*\gamma$. If γ is exact and $\gamma = \mathrm{d}F$, then N is contained in the Lagrangian submanifold generated by F, and if N is a Lagrangian submanifold generated by a function F, then $\mathrm{d}F = \gamma$.

5. Tulczyjew triple and its magnetized version

We shall split the discussion of the Tulczyjew triple into two parts: the classical Tulczyjew triple and the magnetized Tulczyjew triple, though the former is a special case of the later.

5.1. **Classical Tulczyjew triple.** Since (T^*X, ω_X) is a symplectic manifold, there is a vector bundle isomorphism $\beta_X\colon TT^*X \to T^*T^*X$ over T^*X. Let $\alpha_X = \kappa \circ \beta_X$, where $\kappa\colon T^*T^*X \to T^*TX$ is the canonical isomorphism reviewed in Section 3, then we have *Tulczyjew triple*

$$T^*T^*X \xleftarrow[\cong]{\beta_X} TT^*X \xrightarrow[\cong]{\alpha_X} T^*TX. \tag{5.1}$$

Let

$$\vartheta_X^H := \beta_X^*\vartheta_{T^*X}, \quad \vartheta_X^L := \alpha_X^*\vartheta_{TX}. \tag{5.2}$$

Since T^*X is a symplectic manifold, by Proposition 4.1, we have a Hamiltonian special symplectic manifold

$$\boxed{S_X^H := (TT^*X, T^*X, \tau_{T^*X}, \vartheta_X^H)}$$

as usual. With the help of local formula (5.4), one can check that diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} TT^*X & \xrightarrow{\alpha_X} & T^*TX \\ {\scriptstyle T\pi_X}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\pi_{TX}} \\ TX & \xrightarrow{1} & TX \end{array} \tag{5.3}$$

is commutative, so quadruple

$$\boxed{S_X^L := (TT^*X, TX, T\pi_X, \vartheta_X^L)}$$

is a special symplectic manifold. We shall call S_X^L a **Lagrangian special symplectic manifold**.

5.1.1. *Local formulae.* In Section 3, if we take $E \to X$ to be $TX \to X$, then the canonical isomorphism κ: $T^*T^*X \to T^*TX$ has this local representation:

$$(q, p, \dot{p}, \dot{q}) \mapsto (q, -\dot{q}, \dot{p}, p),$$

so we have

$$\boxed{\beta_X(q, p, \dot{q}, \dot{p}) = (q, p, \dot{p}, -\dot{q}), \quad \alpha_X(q, p, \dot{q}, \dot{p}) = (q, \dot{q}, \dot{p}, p)} \tag{5.4}$$

in local representation. Therefore, locally $\vartheta_X^H = \dot{p}_i \,\mathrm{d}q^i - \dot{q}^i \,\mathrm{d}p_i$, $\vartheta_X^L = \dot{p}_i \,\mathrm{d}q^i + p_i \,\mathrm{d}\dot{q}^i$. In more compact form, we have

$$\boxed{\vartheta_X^H = \dot{p} \cdot \mathrm{d}q - \dot{q} \cdot \mathrm{d}p, \quad \vartheta_X^L = \dot{p} \cdot \mathrm{d}q + p \cdot \mathrm{d}\dot{q}} \tag{5.5}$$

locally. In view of the fact that locally $\hat{\vartheta}_X = p \cdot \dot{q}$, we have

$$\boxed{\vartheta_X^L - \vartheta_X^H = \mathrm{d}\hat{\vartheta}_X.} \tag{5.6}$$

Then $\boxed{\mathrm{d}\vartheta_X^L = \mathrm{d}\vartheta_X^H =: \Omega_X}$, so ϑ_X^L and ϑ_X^H yields the same symplectic form Ω_X on TT^*X. Note that locally

$$\boxed{\Omega_X = \mathrm{d}\dot{p}_i \wedge \mathrm{d}q^i + \mathrm{d}p_i \wedge \mathrm{d}\dot{q}^i.} \tag{5.7}$$

In terms of operators i_T and d_T on page 20 for tangent bundle $TT^*X \to T^*X$, we have

$$\boxed{\hat{\vartheta}_X = \mathrm{i}_T\vartheta_X, \quad \vartheta_X^H = \mathrm{i}_T\omega_X, \quad \vartheta_X^L = \mathrm{d}_T\vartheta_X, \quad \Omega_X = \mathrm{d}_T\omega_X} \tag{5.8}$$

whose validity can be checked by local computations based on formulae on page 20.

In summary, there are two special symplectic structures on TT^*X that underlie the symplectic structure Ω_X on TT^*X, the one that corresponds to S_X^H is called the **Hamiltonian special symplectic structure**, and the one that corresponds to S_X^L is called the **Lagrangian special symplectic structure**. When we go from T^*X to a generic symplectic manifold M, the Hamiltonian special symplectic structure still exists (on TM) as usual, but the Lagrangian special symplectic structure ceases to exist. A key observation of this article is that *the Lagrangian special symplectic structure still exist if we go from T^*X to a Sternberg phase space.*

5.2. **Magnetized Tulczyjew triple.** In this subsection we shall assume that G is a compact connected Lie group, $P \xrightarrow{p} X$ is a principal G-bundle with a fixed principal connection form Θ, $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\rho} X$ is the associated fiber bundle with fiber F and the associated G-connection. We further assume that F is a hamiltonian G-space with (G-equivariant) moment map Φ.

Denote by $\mathcal{F}_\sharp$ and $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ the manifolds defined in the pullback diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}_\sharp & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\tau_X}} & \mathcal{F} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho_\sharp} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho} \\ TX & \xrightarrow{\tau_X} & X, \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}^\sharp & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\pi_X}} & \mathcal{F} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho^\sharp} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho} \\ T^*X & \xrightarrow{\pi_X} & X \end{array} \tag{5.9}$$

respectively. We note that the dual vector bundle of $\mathcal{F}_\sharp \overset{\widetilde{\tau_X}}{\to} \mathcal{F}$ is $\mathcal{F}^\sharp \overset{\widetilde{\pi_X}}{\to} \mathcal{F}$, so we have the canonical isomorphism

$$\kappa : T^*\mathcal{F}^\sharp \to T^*\mathcal{F}_\sharp$$

as demonstrated in Section 3. In view of the fact that Sternberg phase space $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ is a symplectic manifold, we have a generalized Tulczyjew triple:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & T\mathcal{F}^\sharp & \\ {\scriptstyle \beta_{\mathscr{F}}} \swarrow & & \searrow {\scriptstyle \alpha_{\mathscr{F}}} \\ T^*\mathcal{F}^\sharp & \xrightarrow[\kappa]{} & T^*\mathcal{F}_\sharp \end{array} \tag{5.10}$$

where isomorphism $\beta_{\mathscr{F}}$ comes from the symplectic structure on $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ and $\alpha_{\mathscr{F}} := \kappa \circ \beta_{\mathscr{F}}$. This generalized Tulczyjew triple shall be referred to as magnetized Tulczyjew triple.

Let

$$\boxed{\vartheta^H_{\mathscr{F}} := \beta^*_{\mathscr{F}} \vartheta_{\mathcal{F}^\sharp}}, \quad \boxed{\vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}} := \alpha^*_{\mathscr{F}} \vartheta_{\mathcal{F}_\sharp}} \tag{5.11}$$

and $\hat{\vartheta}_X$ also denote the pullback of $\hat{\vartheta}_X$ under map $T\rho^\sharp$: $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp \to TT^*X$. Later we shall show that

$$\boxed{\vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}} - \vartheta^H_{\mathscr{F}} = \mathrm{d}\hat{\vartheta}_X.} \tag{5.12}$$

Then $\mathrm{d}\vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}} = \mathrm{d}\vartheta^H_{\mathscr{F}} =: \Omega_{\mathscr{F}}$, so $\vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}}$ and $\vartheta^H_{\mathscr{F}}$ yield the same symplectic form $\Omega_{\mathscr{F}}$ on $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp$. We shall call $\vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}}$ (resp. $\vartheta^H_{\mathscr{F}}$) the **Lagrangian** (resp. **Hamiltonian**) **Liouville form** on $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp$.

5.2.1. *Local formulae.* To get a local formula for $\beta_{\mathscr{F}}$, we need to get a local formula for the symplectic form on $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$. Since we work locally we may assume that $P \to X$ is $X \times G \to X$ and then the connection form Θ is equal to $g^{-1}Ag + g^{-1}\,dg$ where A is a $\mathfrak{g}$-valued differential one-form on X and $g^{-1}\,dg$ is the Maurer-Cartan form on G. The Sternberg symplectic form ω_Θ on $T^*X \times F$ is

$$\omega_X + \Omega - \mathrm{d}\langle A, \Phi\rangle$$

which, in local coordinates, is

$$\mathrm{d}p_i \wedge \mathrm{d}q^i + \frac{1}{2}\Omega_{\alpha\beta}\,\mathrm{d}z^\alpha \wedge \mathrm{d}z^\beta - \frac{1}{2}\langle \partial_i A_j - \partial_j A_i, \Phi\rangle \mathrm{d}q^i \wedge \mathrm{d}q^j + \langle A_i, \partial_\alpha \Phi\rangle \mathrm{d}q^i \wedge \mathrm{d}z^\alpha.$$

Then $\beta_{\mathscr{F}}\colon T\mathcal{F}^\sharp \to T^*\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ can be represented as

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (q,p,z,\dot{q},\dot{p},\dot{z}) & \mapsto & (q,p,z,\ \dot{p}_i - \langle \dot{q}^j(\partial_j A_i - \partial_i A_j), \Phi\rangle - \langle A_i, \dot{z}^\alpha \partial_\alpha \Phi\rangle, \\ & & -\dot{q},\ \dot{z}^\alpha \Omega_{\alpha\beta} + \langle \dot{q}^i A_i, \partial_\beta \Phi\rangle). \end{array} \tag{5.13}$$

Consequently $\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}\colon T\mathcal{F}^\sharp \to T^*\mathcal{F}_\sharp$ can be represented as

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (q,p,z,\dot{q},\dot{p},\dot{z}) & \mapsto & (q,\dot{q},z,\ \dot{p}_i - \langle \dot{q}^j(\partial_j A_i - \partial_i A_j), \Phi\rangle - \langle A_i, \dot{z}^\alpha \partial_\alpha \Phi\rangle, \\ & & p_j,\ \dot{z}^\alpha \Omega_{\alpha\beta} + \langle \dot{q}^i A_i, \partial_\beta \Phi\rangle). \end{array} \tag{5.14}$$

Then locally $\vartheta^H_{\mathscr{F}}$ is equal to

$$(\dot{p}_i - \langle \dot{q}^j(\partial_j A_i - \partial_i A_j), \Phi\rangle - \langle A_i, \dot{z}^\alpha \partial_\alpha \Phi\rangle)\,\mathrm{d}q^i - \dot{q}^i\,\mathrm{d}p_i + (\dot{z}^\alpha \Omega_{\alpha\beta} + \langle \dot{q}^i A_i, \partial_\beta \Phi\rangle)\,\mathrm{d}z^\beta.$$

Similarly, locally $\vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}}$ is equal to

$$(\dot{p}_i - \langle \dot{q}^j(\partial_j A_i - \partial_i A_j), \Phi\rangle - \langle A_i, \dot{z}^\alpha \partial_\alpha \Phi\rangle)\,\mathrm{d}q^i + p_i\,\mathrm{d}\dot{q}^i + (\dot{z}^\alpha \Omega_{\alpha\beta} + \langle \dot{q}^i A_i, \partial_\beta \Phi\rangle)\,\mathrm{d}z^\beta.$$

Since locally $\hat{\vartheta}_X = p_i \dot{q}^i$, identity (5.12) is verified, as promised.

In terms of operators i_T and d_T on page 20 for tangent bundle $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp \to \mathcal{F}^\sharp$, we have

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{rcl} \vartheta^H_{\mathscr{F}} & = & \mathrm{i}_T \omega_\Theta, \\ \vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}} & = & \mathrm{d}_T \vartheta_X + \mathrm{i}_T \Omega_\Theta, \\ \Omega_{\mathscr{F}} & = & \mathrm{d}_T \omega_\Theta \end{array}} \tag{5.15}$$

whose validity can be checked by local computations based on formulae on page 20. Note that ϑ_X is really the pullback of ϑ_X under $\mathcal{F}^\sharp \to T^*X$ and Ω_Θ is really the pullback of Ω_Θ under $\mathcal{F}^\sharp \to \mathcal{F}$.

5.2.2. *Special symplectic structures on $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp$.* Since $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ is a symplectic manifold, by Proposition 4.1, we have a **Hamiltonian special symplectic manifold**

$$\boxed{S^H_{\mathscr{F}} := (T\mathcal{F}^\sharp, \mathcal{F}^\sharp, \tau_{\mathcal{F}^\sharp}, \vartheta^H_{\mathscr{F}})}$$

as usual.

Since diagram (5.3) is commutative, diagram



is commutative, so we have a smooth map $T_{\mathcal{F}}\colon T\mathcal{F}^\sharp \to \mathcal{F}_\sharp$. Locally $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ can be represented as follows:

$$(q, p, z, \dot{q}, \dot{p}, \dot{z}) \quad \mapsto \quad (q, \dot{q}, z). \tag{5.16}$$

This local formulae, together with local formula (5.14), implies that that diagram



is commutative. So quadruple

$$\boxed{S^L_{\mathscr{F}} := (T\mathcal{F}^\sharp, \mathcal{F}_\sharp, T_{\mathcal{F}}, \vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}})}$$

is a special symplectic manifold — the **Lagrangian special symplectic manifold**.

In summary, the magnetized Tulczyjew triple (5.10) yields two special symplectic structures on $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp$, the one with Lagrangian Liouville one-form $\vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}}$ is called the **Lagrangian special symplectic structure** and the one with Hamiltonian Liouville one-form $\vartheta^H_{\mathscr{F}}$ is called the **Hamiltonian special symplectic structure**.

6. TULCZYJEW'S APPROACH FOR PARTICLES IN GAUGE FIELDS

Tulczyjew's approach to classical mechanics has two sides: the Hamiltonian side and the Lagrangian side, and the two sides are unified under a common geometric setting: the dynamics of a particle with configuration space X is determined by a Lagrangian submanifold D of TT^*X, whose description by its Hamiltonian $H\colon T^*X \to \mathbb{R}$ (resp. its Lagrangian $L\colon TX \to \mathbb{R}$) yields the Hamilton (resp. the Euler-Lagrange) equation.

The discussion of Tulczyjew's approach shall be divided into two parts: the Hamiltonian formulation and the Lagrangian formulation.

6.1. The Hamiltonian formulation.

Part of the reasons that Tulczyjew's approach works is the fact that T^*X is a symplectic manifold. When we replace T^*X by a symplectic manifold (M,ω), the Hamiltonian side still survives because Proposition 4.1 says that $(TM, M, \tau_M, \vartheta)$ is special symplectic manifold in which Tulczyjew has introduced [1, page 249]

Definition 6.1 (Tulczyjew's Hamiltonian system)**.** A *Hamiltonian system* in special symplectic manifold

$$(TM, M, \tau_M, \vartheta)$$

is a Lagrangian submanifold N of $(TM, \mathrm{d}\vartheta)$ such that conditions for the existence of the unique form γ stated in Proposition 4.3 are satisfied and γ is exact. The submanifold $K := \tau_M(N)$ is called the *Hamiltonian constraint*, and a function H on K such that $\gamma = -\mathrm{d}H$, is called a *Hamiltonian* of N.

In particular, since $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ is a special symplectic manifold, so we obtain Tulczyjew's Hamiltonian formulation for particles in gauge fields.

To see how this is related to the ordinary Hamiltonian formulation for the dynamics of particles without constraint (i.e., $K = M$), one starts with a parametrized smooth curve c on M. By taking derivative, we get a smooth parametrized curve c' on TM. Now the Hamilton equation for c is nothing but the statement that c' is a smooth parametrized curve on the Lagrangian submanifold N of TM. To verify this we just need to work locally, so we may assume that $(M,\omega) = (T^*\mathbb{R}^n, \omega_{\mathbb{R}^n})$ (Darboux's theorem), then $c = (q,p)$, so $c' = (q,p,q',p')$. Since the Lagrangian submanifold N can be locally described as the set of points

$$\left(q, p, \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}, -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q}\right),$$

so c' is a a smooth parametrized curve on N means precisely that the Hamilton equation

$$q' = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p} = \{q, H\}, \quad p' = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q} = \{p, H\} \tag{6.1}$$

is satisfied.

6.2. **The Lagrangian formulation.** In this subsection we shall assume that G is a compact connected Lie group, $P \xrightarrow{p} X$ is a principal G-bundle with a fixed principal connection form Θ, $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\rho} X$ is the associated fiber bundle with fiber F and the associated G-connection. We further assume that F is a hamiltonian G-space with (G-equivariant) moment map Φ, symplectic form Ω. Recall that $S^L_{\mathscr{F}} := (T\mathcal{F}^\sharp, \mathcal{F}_\sharp, T_{\mathcal{F}}, \vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}})$ is a special symplectic manifold. Mimicking Tulczyjew [1, page 251], we have the following definition.

Definition 1 (Main Definition)**.** A *Lagrangian system* in $S^L_{\mathscr{F}}$ is a Lagrangian submanifold N of $(T\mathcal{F}^\sharp, \mathrm{d}\vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}})$ such that conditions for the existence of the unique form γ stated in Proposition 4.3 are satisfied and γ is exact. The submanifold $J := T_{\mathcal{F}}(N)$ is called the *Lagrangian constraint*, and a function L on J such that $\gamma = \mathrm{d}L$, is called a *Lagrangian* of N.

Note that when G is trivial and F is a point, we have $S^L_{\mathscr{F}} = S^L_X$, then the above definition becomes Tulczyjew's definition 4.4 in Ref. [1].

To get the Euler-Lagrange equation for the dynamics without constraint (i.e., $J = \mathcal{F}_\sharp$) , one starts with a parametrized smooth curve γ on $\mathcal{F}$, then we get a parametrized smooth curve $(\gamma, (\rho\circ\gamma)')$ on $\mathcal{F}_\sharp$, so we arrive at a parametrized smooth curve c on $T^*\mathcal{F}$ defined by the following commutative diagram



By taking derivative, we get a smooth parametrized curve c' on $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp$. Now the Euler-Lagrange equation for γ is nothing but the statement that c' is a smooth parametrized curve on the Lagrangian submanifold N of $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp$. In terms of local coordinates, we can written $\gamma = (q, z)$. This really means that, locally we represent γ by $(q, z)\circ\gamma$, but for notational sanity, $(q, z)\circ\gamma$ is also denoted by (q, z). So (q, z) is either a local function on $\mathcal{F}$ or a local function on $\mathbb{R}$, depending on the context. With this understood, we have $c = (q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}}|_{\dot{q}=q'}, z)$, so

$$c' = \left(q, \left.\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}}\right|_{\dot{q}=q'}, z, q', \frac{d}{dt}\left(\left.\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}}\right|_{\dot{q}=q'}\right), z'\right).$$

Since the Lagrangian submanifold N can be locally described as the set of points

$$\left(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}}, z, \dot{q}, \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} + \langle \dot{q}^j(\partial_j A_i - \partial_i A_j), \Phi\rangle + \langle A_i, \dot{z}^\beta \partial_\beta \Phi\rangle, \dot{z}^\alpha\right)$$

where $\dot{z}^\alpha = \left(\partial_\beta L - \langle \dot{q}^i A_i, \partial_\beta \Phi\rangle\right)\Omega^{\beta\alpha}$ with $[\Omega^{\alpha\beta}] = [\Omega_{\alpha\beta}]^{-1}$. Therefore, c' is a a smooth parametrized curve on N means that, locally

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \frac{dz^\alpha}{dt} &= \left(\left.\frac{\partial L}{\partial z^\beta}\right|_{\dot{q}=q'} - \frac{dq^k}{dt}\left\langle A_k, \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial z^\beta}\right\rangle\right)\Omega^{\beta\alpha} \\ \frac{d}{dt}\left(\left.\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i}\right|_{\dot{q}=q'}\right) &= \left.\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i}\right|_{\dot{q}=q'} + \frac{dq^j}{dt}\left\langle \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial q^j} - \frac{\partial A_j}{\partial q^i}, \Phi\right\rangle + \frac{dz^\alpha}{dt}\left\langle A_i, \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial z^\alpha}\right\rangle \end{aligned}} \tag{6.2}$$

Theorem 1 (Main Theorem)**.** *Assume the data in the beginning of this subsection and L: $\mathcal{F}_\sharp \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth map. For the unconstrained particle dynamics with configuration space X, internal space F, gauge field Θ, and Lagrangian L, the following statements are true.*

(1) *The equation of motion can be locally written as Eq.* (6.2)*.*
(2) *If (x, y) is a Darboux (local) coordinate for (F, Ω) so that $\Omega = \mathrm{d}x \wedge \mathrm{d}y$ locally, then Eq.* (6.2) *is the Euler-Lagrange equation for Lagrangian*

$$\mathcal{L} := L - \langle \dot{q}^i A_i, \Phi \rangle + x \cdot \dot{y}. \tag{6.3}$$

(3) *The action functional for homologically trivial smooth loop γ: $\mathrm{S}^1 \to \mathcal{F}$ is*

$$S[\gamma] := \int_{\mathrm{S}^1} (\gamma, (\rho \circ \gamma)')^* L \; dt + \int_\Sigma \tilde{\gamma}^* \Omega_\Theta \tag{6.4}$$

where Σ is an oriented compact 2-manifold with $\mathrm{S}^1 = \partial\Sigma$, $\tilde{\gamma}$: $\Sigma \to \mathcal{F}$ is a smooth extension of γ, and Ω_Θ is the Sternberg form on $\mathcal{F}$.

(4) *There is a generalized version of Dirac's charge quantization condition:*

$$\left[\frac{\Omega_\Theta}{2\pi}\right] \in \mathrm{Range}\left(H^2(\mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} 1} H^2(\mathcal{F}; \mathbb{R})\right). \tag{6.5}$$

I.e., the cohomology class represented by the closed real differential two-form $\frac{\Omega_\Theta}{2\pi}$ is an integral lattice point of the 2nd cohomology group of $\mathcal{F}$ with real coefficient.

Proof. Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ in Eq. (6.3) emerges out of a short straightforward computation in calculus of variations. Action S in Eq. (6.4) is obtained from $\mathcal{L}$ with the help of Stokes' theorem in calculus and the fact that in dimension one the oriented bordism group coincides with the integral homology group. To arrive at the charge quantization condition (6.5) we demand the uniqueness of $\exp[iS[\gamma]]$, and use the fact that in dimension two the oriented bordism group coincides with the integral homology group as well as the universal coefficient theorem in algebraic topology. □

It is equally easy to write down the equation of motion locally for a Lagrangian system with a generic Lagrangian constraint.

Remark 1. The generalized Dirac quantization condition (6.5) is equivalent to the condition that the Sternberg phase is prequantizable, i.e., $[\omega_\Theta] \in H^2(\mathcal{F}^\sharp; \mathbb{R})$ is integral. That is because $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ and $\mathcal{F}$ are homotopy equivalent, and ω_X is an exact differential 2-form.

Remark 2. The main theorem in particular tells us how to incorporate a Yang-Mills field in the Lagrangian formulation: just shift the ordinary Lagrangian $L(q, \dot{q})$ by two terms: the Lorentz term $-\langle \dot{q}^i A_i(q), \Phi(y, x) \rangle$ and the new extra term $x \cdot \dot{y}$. Note that $x \cdot \dot{y}$ can be replaced by $-y \cdot \dot{x}$ or $\frac{1}{2}(x \cdot \dot{y} - \dot{y} \cdot x)$, etc.

For simplicity we shall write $\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i}\Big|_{\dot{q}=q'}\right)$ as $\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i}\right)$, $\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i}\Big|_{\dot{q}=q'}$ as $\frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i}$. Let

$$\partial_F L := \tfrac{\partial L}{\partial z^\alpha}\, \mathrm{d}z^\alpha, \qquad \{f, g\}_F := \Omega^{\alpha\beta} \tfrac{\partial f}{\partial z^\alpha} \tfrac{\partial g}{\partial z^\beta}$$

$$\tfrac{Dz}{dt} := \tfrac{dz^\alpha}{dt} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial z^\alpha} + Y_{q' \cdot A}, \quad F_{ji} := \tfrac{\partial A_i}{\partial q^j} - \tfrac{\partial A_j}{\partial q^i} + [A_i, A_j].$$

With the help of Eqs. (2.3) and (2.4), we have

Corollary 1. *Equation* (6.2) *becomes*

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i}\right) &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial q^i} + \frac{dq^j}{dt}\langle F_{ji}, \Phi\rangle + \{L, \langle A_i, \Phi\rangle\}_F \\ \frac{Dz}{dt}\lrcorner\,\Omega &= \partial_F L \end{aligned}} \tag{6.6}$$

provided that F is a homogeneous Hamiltonian G-space.

Example 1 (Dynamics of electrically charged particles)**.** When $G = \mathrm{U}(1)$, F is a co-adjoint orbit of G (hence a point $-q_{\mathrm{e}} \in \mathbb{R}$) with Φ being the inclusion map, the second equation becomes $0 = 0$, so the equation of motion becomes the more familiar equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}}\right) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q} - q_{\mathrm{e}}\; q'\lrcorner F. \tag{6.7}$$

In particular, if $X = \mathbb{R}^3$, $L = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\mathbf{r}}\cdot\dot{\mathbf{r}}$ and $\mathbf{B} = F_{23}\,\mathbf{i} + F_{31}\,\mathbf{j} + F_{12}\,\mathbf{k}$, Eq. (6.7) becomes the textbook equation of motion

$$\mathbf{r}'' = q_{\mathrm{e}}\; \mathbf{r}' \times \mathbf{B}$$

with $m = 1$ and $c = 1$. In case $X = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and $\mathbf{B} = q_{\mathrm{m}}\frac{\mathbf{r}}{r^3}$, condition (6.5) becomes Dirac's *charge quantization condition* [15]:

$$q_{\mathrm{e}}\, q_{\mathrm{m}} \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$$

with $\hbar = 1$ and $c = 1$.

Example 2 (Wong's equations [3])**.** With the data in this subsection, we further assume that X is a Lorentzian manifold with Lorentz metric g, $L = \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}\dot{q}^\mu\dot{q}^\nu$, F is a co-adjoint orbit of G and Φ is the inclusion map. Let $p_\mu = g_{\mu\nu}\dot{q}^\nu$, $\Phi = -\xi_a\hat{T}^a$ where $\hat{T}^a$'s form a basis for $\mathfrak{g}^*$, then the two equations in Eq. (6.6) become Wong's equations [5, equations (1a) and (1b)] constrained to the Sternberg phase space $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$. Since $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ is a symplectic leaf of Wong's phase space (a Poisson manifold) and solutions to Wong's equations are always constrained to symplectic leaves of Wong's phase space [5, Theorem 2], we effectively arrive at Wong's equations on Wong's phase space, for which a Lagrangian was constructed in Ref. [19, equation (2.6)].

Example 3 (Magnetized Kepler problems [21])**.** Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer and μ be a real number, we consider the $(2k+1)$-dimensional magnetized Kepler problem with magnetic charge μ. Here, $X = \mathbb{R}^{2k+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, $G = \mathrm{SO}(2k)$, $P \to X$ is the pullback of the principal G-bundle of $\mathrm{SO}(2k+1) \to \mathrm{S}^{2k}$ under map $\mathbf{r} \mapsto \frac{\mathbf{r}}{|\mathbf{r}|}$, Θ is the pullback of the canonical invariant connection on $\mathrm{SO}(2k+1) \to \mathrm{S}^{2k}$, F is the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\mu$ of G and Φ is just the inclusion map; see Ref. [21] for more details. The Hamiltonian is

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{p} - \frac{1}{r} + \frac{\mu^2/2k}{r^2},$$

the pullback of a real function on T^*X, and the Lagrangian is

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\mathbf{r}}\cdot\dot{\mathbf{r}} + \frac{1}{r} - \frac{\mu^2/2k}{r^2},$$

the pullback of a real function on TX. It is clear that H and L are related by the Legendre transformation. If $k > 1$, the generalized Dirac quantization condition (6.5) is equivalent to the condition that the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\mu$ is prequantizable.

Remark 3. In the geometric approach here the Lagrangian takes simpler form L and the equation of motion takes complicated form. In the textbook's approach to dynamics of electrically charged particles, the Lagrangian takes complicated form $\mathcal{L}$ and the equation of motion is still the simple-looking Euler-Lagrange equation. A similar remark is valid for the Hamiltonian approaches. (Sternberg's Hamiltonian approach is our geometric approach to unconstrained Hamiltonian systems.) As usual, the geometric approach captures the essence of the problem, hence works much more generally.

Remark 4. The dynamics of a charged particle is a Lagrangian submanifold of the symplectic manifold $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp$, and the two distinct special symplectic structures on $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ correspond to the two formulations of dynamics, one is Hamiltonian and one is Lagrangian. Since a Lagrangian submanifold of the symplectic manifold $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ may not come from a real function on either $\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ or $\mathcal{F}_\sharp$, this geometric approach goes much beyond what Sternberg's Hamiltonian approach can handle.

Let us conclude this subsection with the following diagram:



6.3. **The Legendre transformation.** For completeness we give a sketch of the Legendre transformation for the experts. The general readers who wish to know more details should consult sections 5 and 6 in Ref. [1].

Definition 6.2 (The Legendre transformation)**.** The identity symplectic diffeomorphism $1_{T\mathcal{F}^\sharp}$ from $S^L_\mathscr{F}$ to $S^H_\mathscr{F}$ is called the Legendre transformation, and the identity symplectic diffeomorphism $1_{T\mathcal{F}^\sharp}$ from $S^H_\mathscr{F}$ to $S^L_\mathscr{F}$ is called the inverse Legendre transformation.

Since $\vartheta^L_\mathscr{F} - \vartheta^H_\mathscr{F} = \mathrm{d}\hat{\vartheta}_X$, we have

Proposition 6.1. *The Legendre transformation is generated by $-\Phi_\mathscr{F}$ where*

$$\Phi_\mathscr{F}: \quad \mathcal{F}_\sharp \times_\mathcal{F} \mathcal{F}^\sharp \to \mathbb{R}$$

is the map that sends $((q,\dot{q},z),(q,p,z))$ to $\langle\dot{q},p\rangle$. The inverse Legendre transformation is generated by

$$\tilde{\Phi}_\mathscr{F}: \quad \mathcal{F}^\sharp \times_\mathcal{F} \mathcal{F}_\sharp \to \mathbb{R}$$

is the map that sends $((q,p,z),(q,\dot{q},z))$ to $\langle\dot{q},p\rangle$.

If f is a function of x with a unique critical point x_0, we use $\mathrm{Stat}_x[f(x)]$ to denote $f(x_0)$.

Example 4. Let N be a Lagrangian submanifold of $T\mathcal{F}^\sharp$ which is a generated by a map $L\colon \mathcal{F}_\sharp \to \mathbb{R}$ and also a map $-H\colon \mathcal{F}^\sharp \to \mathbb{R}$. Then L and H are related by $H(y) = \mathrm{Stat}_x[\Phi(x,y) - L(x)]$ subject to constraint $\widetilde{\tau_X}(x) = \widetilde{\pi_X}(y)$, and $L(x) = \mathrm{Stat}_y[\tilde{\Phi}(y,x) - H(x)]$ subject to the same constraint. In terms of local coordinates, we have $H(q,p,z) =$

$p \cdot \dot{q} - L(q, \dot{q}, z)$ evaluated at $\dot{q}$ such that $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}^i} = p_i$, and $L(q, \dot{q}, z) = p \cdot \dot{q} - H(q, p, z)$ evaluated at p such that $\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} = q^i$.

APPENDIX A. USEFUL FACTS

A.1. **Tangent lift** [18]**.** Let X be a smooth manifold and TX be its total tangent space. The tangent lift, denoted by d_T, is a map the sends a differential k-form on X to a differential k-form on TX. By definition,

$$\mathrm{d}_T = \mathrm{d} \circ \mathrm{i}_T + \mathrm{i}_T \circ \mathrm{d} \tag{A.1}$$

where i_T is a map that sends a differential $(k+1)$-form on X to a differential k-form on TX as follows: for $\alpha \in \Omega^{k+1}(X)$, $\mathrm{i}_T(\alpha) \in \Omega^k(TX)$ is defined via equation

$$\mathrm{i}_T(\alpha)|_v = \tilde{v} \lrcorner \, \tau_X^* \alpha|_v \quad \text{for any } v \in TX. \tag{A.2}$$

Here $\tilde{v} \in T_v TX$ is any horizontal lift of $v \in T_{\tau_X(v)} X$. For simplicity, we use the same symbol for a differential form on X and its pullback on TX. Then, in terms of local coordinate q and $(q, \dot{q})$ on X and TX, we have

$$\mathrm{i}_T \left(\alpha_{i_0 \cdots i_k} \, \mathrm{d}q^{i_0} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathrm{d}q^{i_k} \right) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} (-1)^j \dot{q}^{i_j} \alpha_{i_0 \cdots i_k} \, \mathrm{d}q^{i_0} \wedge \cdots \widehat{\mathrm{d}q^{i_j}} \cdots \wedge \mathrm{d}q^{i_k}$$

where the hat on $\mathrm{d}q^{i_j}$ means that $\mathrm{d}q^{i_j}$ is missing.

A.2. **"Cotangent map"** T_f^***.** Let $f\colon Y \to X$ be a smooth map. While there is a canonical morphism from the tangent bundle of Y to the tangent bundle of X, there is no canonical morphism from the cotangent bundle of Y to the cotangent bundle of X. However, if $f\colon Y \to X$ is a fiber bundle with a (Ehresmann) connection, then, for any $y \in Y$, if H_y is the horizontal subspace of $T_y Y$, we have $T_{f(y)} X \cong H_y \subset T_y Y$, so we have a linear map $T_y^* Y \to T_{f(y)}^* X$ which, upon being globalized, becomes the top arrow T_f^* in the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^*Y & \xrightarrow{T_f^*} & T^*X \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_Y}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_X} \\ Y & \xrightarrow{f} & X \end{array}$$

which is a morphism from the cotangent bundle of Y to the cotangent bundle of X.

A.2.1. *Local formula for* T_f^*. Here we assume that $f\colon Y \to X$ is the fiber bundle with fiber F, associated to the principal G-bundle $P \xrightarrow{p} X$ with a principal connection, so $f\colon Y \to X$ has an associated G-connection. To work out a local formula for $T_f^*\colon T^*Y \to T^*X$, we may assume that X is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n$, $P \xrightarrow{p} X$ is trivial, and F is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^l$. Upon fixing a diffeomorphism $q\colon X \to \mathbb{R}^n$, a diffeomorphism $z\colon F \to \mathbb{R}^l$, and a local trivialization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xleftarrow[\cong]{\phi} & X \times G \\ & {\scriptstyle p}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle p_1} & \\ & X & \end{array}$$

we have a diffeomorphism $Y \cong \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l$ which shall be denoted by (q, z). We also have diffeomorphisms

$$T^*Y \cong \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l \times (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l)^* \cong (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad T^*X \cong \mathbb{R}^n \times (\mathbb{R}^n)^* \cong (\mathbb{R}^n)^2$$

and they shall be denoted by (q, z, p, y) and (q, p) respectively. Finally, the infinitesimal action of $\mathfrak{g}$ on F assigns a vector field Y_ξ on F to each $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. Let us also use Y_ξ to denote the coordinator vector of Y_ξ with respect to the local tangent frame $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\alpha}$.

Under the trivialization ϕ, the principal connection on $P \xrightarrow{p} X$ is represented by a $\mathfrak{g}$-valued differential one-form $A \cdot \mathrm{d}q := A_i \, \mathrm{d}q^i$ on X, so the horizontal tangent vector of Y can be represented by

$$(q, z, \dot{q}, -Y_{\dot{q}\cdot A}).$$

Therefore, the map $T^*Y \xrightarrow{T_f^*} T^*X$ can be represented by

$$\boxed{(q, z, p, y) \mapsto \big(q^i, p_j - y \cdot Y_{A_j}\big).} \tag{A.3}$$

APPENDIX B. A LIST OF SYMBOLS

$\lrcorner$	the interior product of vectors with forms
$\wedge$	the wedge product of forms
d	the exterior derivative operator
d_T	the tangent lift operator
$\tau_X : TX \to X$	the tangent bundle projection
$\pi_X : T^*X \to X$	the cotangent bundle projection
$\vartheta_X, \omega_X := \mathrm{d}\vartheta_X$	the Liouville form, the symplectic form on T^*X
$\hat{\vartheta}_X : TT^*X \to \mathbb{R}$	the map such that $\hat{\vartheta}_X\|_{T_\alpha(T^*X)} = \vartheta_X\|_\alpha$
f^*	the pullback on differential forms under smooth map f
Tf	the tangent map of f
$T_m f$	the linearization of f at point m
T^*_f	see appendix A for definition
$q, (q, \dot{q}), (q, p)$	local coordinate map on X, TX, T^*X
$\pi : E \to X$	a real vector bundle over X
$p_E : T^*E \to E^*$	see the explanation right before diagram (3.2)
$(q, u), (q, \alpha), (q, \hat{u})$	local coordinate map on E, E^*, E^{**}
$q(t)$	a smooth parametrized curve on X
$q'(t)$	the derivative of $q(t)$, it is a smooth parametrized curve on TX
$\iota : E \to E^{**}$	the usual identification
G	a compact connected Lie group, viewed as a Lie subgroup of a rotation group
$\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}^*$	the Lie algebra of G and its dual
ξ	an element in $\mathfrak{g}$
$\langle\ ,\ \rangle$	the paring of elements in vector space V with elements in V^*
Ad_a	the adjoint action of $a \in G$ on $\mathfrak{g}$
$P \to X$	a principal G-bundle
Θ	a $\mathfrak{g}$-valued differential one-form on P that defines a principal connection on $P \to X$
R_a	the right action on P by $a \in G$
X_ξ	the vector field on P which represents the infinitesimal right action on P by $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$
$\phi : X \times G \to P$	a local trivialization of $P \to X$
A_ϕ or simply A	a $\mathfrak{g}$-valued differential one-form on X which locally represents Θ under trivialization ϕ
F	a hamiltonian G-space
$\mathcal{F} := P \times_G F$	$P \times F$ quotient by equivalence relation $(p, f) \sim (R_{a^{-1}}(p), L_a(f))$
$z, (z, y)$	local coordinate map on F, T^*F
$\Phi : F \to \mathfrak{g}^*$	the G-equivariant moment map
L_a	the left action on F by $a \in G$
Y_ξ	the vector field on F which represents the infinitesimal left action on F by $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. It also denotes the coordinate vector of Y_ξ
$\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\rho} X$	the associated fiber bundle with fiber F
$\mathcal{F}^\sharp \xrightarrow{\rho^\sharp} T^*X, \mathcal{F}_\sharp \xrightarrow{\rho_\sharp} TX$	the pullback bundle of $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\rho} X$ under π_X, τ_X
one forms $\vartheta^L_{\mathscr{F}}$ and $\vartheta^H_{\mathscr{F}}$	see Subsection 5.2.2 for their definition

REFERENCES

[1] W. M. Tulczyjew. Hamiltonian systems, Lagrangian systems, and the Legendre transformation. *(Symposia Mathematica vol XIV) (Convegno di Geometria Simplettica e Fisica Matematica, INDAM, Rome, 1973)* (London: Academic Press) pp 247-258

[2] S. Sternberg. Minimal coupling and the symplectic mechanics of a classical particle in the presence of a Yang-Mills field. *Proc Nat. Acad. Sci.* **74** (1977), 5253-5254.

[3] S. K. Wong. Field and particle equations for the classical Yang-Mills field and particles with isotopic spin. *Nuevo Cimento* A **65** (1970), 689.

[4] A. Weinstein. A universal phase space for particles in Yang-Mills fields. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **2** (1978), 417-420.

[5] R. Montgomery. Canonical formulations of a classical particle in a Yang-Mills field and Wong's equations. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **8** (1984), 59-67.

[6] J. Pradines. Théorie de Lie pour les groupoïdes differentiables. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, série* A **266** (1968), 1194-1196.

[7] J. Grabowski and M. Rotkiewicz. Higher vector bundles and multi-graded symplectic manifolds. *J. Geom. Phys.* **59** (2009), 1285-1305.

[8] K. C. H. Mackenzie. Double Lie algebroids and second-order geometry. I. *Adv. Math.*, **94**(2) (1992): 180-239. Double Lie algebroids and second-order geometry. II. *Adv. Math.*, **154**(1) (2000): 46-75.

[9] T. Voronov. Q-manifolds and Mackenzie theory. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **315**(2) (2012), 279-310.

[10] J. P. Dufour. Introduction aux tissus. *Séminaire Gaston Darboux de Géométrie et Topologie Différentielle*, 1990/1991 (Montpellier, 1990/1991), Univ. Montpellier II, Montpellier, 1992, pp. 55-76. K. Konieczna and P. Urbański. Double vector bundles and duality. *Arch. Math. (Brno)* **35** (1999), 59-95. J. Grabowski and P. Urbański. Algebroids - general differential calculi on vector bundles. *J. Geom. Phys.* **31** (1999), 111-141.

[11] K. Grabowska, J. Grabowski, P. Urbański. Geometrical Mechanics on algebroids. *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **3** (2006), 559-575.

[12] W. M. Tulczyjew and P. Urbański. "An affine framework for the dynamics of charged particles", in La "Mécanique analytique de Lagrange et son heritage. *Atti Accad. Sci. Torino* **126**(suppl. 2) (1992), 66-71.

[13] P. Urbański. "An affine framework for analytical mechanics", in "Classical and Quantum Integrability". *Banach Center Publ.* **59**(2003), 257-279.

[14] K. Grabowska, J. Grabowski, P. Urbański. AV-differential geometry: Poisson and Jacobi structures. *Journal of Geometry and Physics* **52** (2004), 398-446.

[15] P. Dirac. Quantized Singularities in the Electromagnetic Field. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* A **133** (1931), 60-72.

[16] W. M. Tulczyjew and P. Urbański. Liouville structures. *arXiv*:0806.1333

[17] W. M. Tulczyjew and P. Urbański. A Slow and Careful Legendre Transformation for Singular Lagrangians. *Acta Physica Polonica B* **30** (1999), 2909-2979.

[18] Pidello and W. M. Tulczyjew. Derivations of differential forms on jet bundles. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* **147** (1987), 249-265.

[19] A. P. Balachandran, S. Borchardt, and A. Stern. Lagrangian and Hamiltonian Descriptions of Yang-Mills Particles. *Phys. Rev.* D **17**(1978), 32-47.

[20] J. Sniatycki and W. M. Tulczyjew. Generating forms of Lagrangian submanifolds. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **22** (1972), 267-275.

[21] G. W. Meng. The Poisson realization of so (2, 2k+ 2) on magnetic leaves and generalized MICZ-Kepler problems. J. Math. Phys. **54**, 052902 (2013).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HONG KONG UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, CLEAR WATER BAY, KOWLOON, HONG KONG

E-mail address: mameng@ust.hk